

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 124

March 30, 1995, 9:31 p.m.  
Page S-4914 Temp. Record

## DISASTER SUPPLEMENTAL-RESCISSIONS/GSA Buildings and Courthouses

**SUBJECT:** Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Act . . . H.R. 1158. Shelby second-degree substitute amendment No. 437 to the Kerrey/Cohen amendment No. 435 to the Hatfield substitute amendment No. 420.

### ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 78-16

**SYNOPSIS:** As introduced, H.R. 1158, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Disaster Assistance and Rescissions Act, will provide \$5.360 billion in emergency appropriations for disaster assistance, and will rescind \$17.188 billion for various Departments and agencies.

The Hatfield substitute amendment would strike the provisions of H.R. 1158 and insert in lieu thereof the text of S. 617, as reported, which would provide \$6.700 billion in disaster assistance (the amount requested by the President), would rescind \$13.286 billion for various Departments and agencies, and would provide for expedited salvage timber sales on Federal lands for fiscal years 1995 and 1996.

The Kerrey/Cohen amendment would rescind an additional \$324.6 million for General Service Administration (GSA) Federal buildings and courthouse construction projects (the Hatfield substitute amendment would rescind \$241 million for those projects), including:

- \$121.9 million for the Federal building and U.S. Courthouse in Phoenix, Arizona;
- \$70 million for the Federal building and U.S. Courthouse in Tucson, Arizona;
- \$58 million for the Southeast Federal Center in the District of Columbia (in addition to the \$25 million proposed rescission in the substitute amendment); and
- \$26.3 million more for the U.S. Courthouse in Hammond, Indiana (in addition to the \$26 million proposed rescission in the substitute amendment).

The Shelby second-degree substitute amendment to the Kerrey amendment would rescind \$1.84 billion for GSA construction projects on which construction has not yet begun.

(See other side)

YEAS (78)			NAYS (16)		NOT VOTING (6)	
Republicans (50 or 98%)	Democrats (28 or 65%)		Republicans (1 or 2%)	Democrats (15 or 35%)	Republicans (3)	Democrats (3)
Abraham	Inhofe	Biden	Bond	Akaka	Faircloth <sup>-2</sup>	Baucus <sup>-2</sup>
Ashcroft	Jeffords	Bingaman		Boxer	Grams <sup>-4</sup>	Conrad <sup>-2</sup>
Bennett	Kempthorne	Bradley		Byrd	Kassebaum <sup>-4</sup>	Dorgan <sup>-2</sup>
Brown	Kyl	Breaux		Feinstein		
Burns	Lott	Bryan		Ford		
Campbell	Lugar	Bumpers		Graham		
Chafee	Mack	Daschle		Inouye		
Coats	McCain	Dodd		Johnston		
Cochran	McConnell	Exon		Mikulski		
Cohen	Murkowski	Feingold		Moseley-Braun		
Coverdell	Nickles	Glenn		Moynihan		
Craig	Packwood	Harkin		Murray		
D'Amato	Pressler	Heflin		Rockefeller		
DeWine	Roth	Hollings		Sarbanes		
Dole	Santorum	Kennedy		Simon		
Domenici	Shelby	Kerrey				
Frist	Simpson	Kerry				
Gorton	Smith	Kohl				
Gramm	Snowe	Lautenberg				
Grassley	Specter	Leahy				
Gregg	Stevens	Levin				
Hatch	Thomas	Lieberman				
Hatfield	Thompson	Nunn				
Helms	Thurmond	Pell				
Hutchison	Warner	Pryor				
		Reid				
		Robb				
		Wellstone				

#### EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

#### SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

NOTE: Following the vote, the Kerrey amendment, as amended, was adopted by voice vote. An earlier attempt to table the Kerrey amendment had failed (see vote No. 122).

**Those favoring** the amendment contended:

The cuts in the Shelby amendment would be spread fairly evenly across the country. Unlike the Kerrey amendment, the lion's share of the rescissions would not strike a handful of States. Also unlike the Kerrey amendment, there is a clear rational basis for making these rescissions--any GSA project for which funds have been appropriated, but on which construction has not yet started, would lose funding. Senators who stated that their sole motivation in supporting the previous amendment was to save money should be delighted to join us in voting in favor of the Shelby amendment, which would rescind nearly 5 times as much. We therefore expect this amendment to pass overwhelmingly.

**No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.**